IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.V.K.BALI
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.RAMACHANDRAN

TUESDAY, THE 16TH JANUARY 2007 / 26TH PAUSHA 1928

WP(C).No. 656 of 2007(C)

PETITIONER:

PRASAD KUMAR, S/O.SADASIVAN NAIR,
POTTAKKUZHIVILA VEEDU, NADOORKOLLA DESOM,
KOLLAYIL VILLAGE, AMARAVILA P.O.,
NEYYATTINKARA TALUK.

BY ADV. SRI.G.SUDHEER

RESPONDENTS:
---

1. TRAVANCORE DEVASWOM BOARD,
REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER,
DEVASWOM BOARD OFFICE, NANDANCODE,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. CHIEF ENGINEER,
TRAVANCORE DEVASWOM BOARD, DEVASWOM BOARD OFFICE,
NANDANCODE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

3. ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER,
NEYYATTINKARA GROUP, TRAVANCORE DEVASWOM BOARD,
NEYYATTINKARA P.O.

4. EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
OFFICE OF EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
TRAVANCORE DEVASWOM BOARD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

5. THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE,
THIRUNARAYANAPURAM SREE MAHAGANAPATHI TEMPLE,
AMARAVILA P.O., NEYYATTINKARA, REPRESENTED BY ITS
PRESIDENT.

6. P.PALANI ASSARI,
PANNAPLA THEKKETHIL, PARUMALA P.O.,
ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT, PIN-685 676.

R1 TO R5 BY STANDING COUNSEL MR.M.K.CHANDRAMOHAN DAS

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 16/01/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

V.K. BALI, C.J. & M.RAMACHANDRAN, J.

W.P.(C) No. 656 of 2007

Dated, this the 16th day of January, 2007

JUDGMENT

V.K.Bali,C.J.(Oral)

S.Prasad Kumar, a devotee, has filed this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus commanding respondents 1 to 4 to take steps to complete the reconstruction of Amaravila Thirunarayanapuram Mahaganapathy temple and conduct the 'Kumbabhishekam' within the month of 'Makayiram' 1182 M.E. (February 2nd week of 2007) with the specifications as per Ext.P5 revised estimate. Before we might proceed further we would like to mention that in view of the nature of the order that we propose to pass there will be no need to issue notice to the 6th respondent, the contractor.

2. On instructions, Mr.M.K.Chandramohan Das, learned Standing Counsel appearing for the respondents 1 to 5 states that the work was to be completed as mentioned in the petition,

but the contractor to whom work was allotted has not completed the work as scheduled. He further states that a notice shall be given to the 6th respondent asking him to do the needful and if he will not proceed in the matter and complete the construction, necessary remedial measures would be taken and appropriate orders shall be passed. The statement made by the learned counsel would clearly suggest that the work of construction is being monitored by respondents 1 to 5 and there will be no need to issue any direction as such. The statement made by the learned counsel stands recorded and in view thereof this writ petition is closed.

V.K. BALI,
CHIEF JUSTICE.

M.RAMACHANDRAN,
JUDGE.

vns